

LIPSITZ & MCALLISTER, LLC

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ATTORNEYS

BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 8 755 MAIN STREET MONROE, CONNECTICUT 06468

TELEPHONE: (203) 459-0200 FACSIMILE: (203) 459-0201

In re Application of:

Christof Kindervater

Application No.:

10/608,277 June 27, 2003

Filed: For:

DOUGLAS M. MCALLISTER

ENERGY ABSORBING SYSTEMS AND PROCESSES, AND PROCESSES

FOR THE PRODUCTION OF ENERGY ABSORBING STRUCTURAL

ELEMENTS

Mail Stop Amendment Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450

Art Unit:

1772

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Examiner: M. Miggins

Sir:

Transmitted herewith is:

[X] Response to Restriction Requirement (2 pages)

[X] Return receipt postage prepaid postcard;

[X]I certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on January 19, 2006.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the payment of the required fee(s) or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0625.

Very truly yours,

Douglas M. McAllister Attorney for Applicant(s) Registration No. 37,886 Lipsitz & McAllister, LLC

755 Main Street

Monroe, Connecticut 06468

(203) 459-0200

Attorney Docket No.: **HOE-492.1**



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)
Christof Kindervater) Examiner: M. Miggins
Application No.: 10/608,277) Art Unit: 1772
Filed: June 27, 2003)
)

For: ENERGY ABSORBING SYSTEMS AND PROCESSES, AND PROCESSES FOR THE PRODUCTION OF ENERGY ABSORBING STRUCTURAL ELEMENTS

MAIL STOP: Amendment Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop: Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

Signature: Caral Prenter

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Dear Sir:

This is a response to the second Restriction Requirement mailed on January 12, 2006.

REMARKS

Summary

The Examiner has issued a second restriction requirement due to the fact that the Examiner identified the wrong class and subclass for the invention covered by claims 35-78 in the original restriction requirement mailed on September 29, 2005.